



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,327	09/29/2003	Peter Lang	2058.233US1	4654
50400	7590	11/16/2009	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/SAP			SANDERS, AARON J	
P.O. BOX 2938			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			2168	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/16/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com  
request@slwip.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/674,327	LANG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	AARON SANDERS	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-12 and 14-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-12 and 14-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 29 September 2009 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

The amendment filed 29 September 2009 has been entered. Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-16 are pending. Claim 1 is currently amended. Claims 2, 13, and 17-33 are cancelled. No claims are new.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, the limitation “the user input identifying: ... a first identifier... and... a second identifier” is new matter. It does not appear from the specification that the user input identifies the first and second identifier.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falkenhainer et al., U.S. 5,930,801 (“Falkenhainer”), in view of Owens et al., U.S. 6,047,284 (“Owens”).

1. Falkenhainer teaches “*A computer program product, tangibly embodied in one or more information storage devices, for tailoring the storage of information, the computer program product comprising instructions operable to cause one or more data processing apparatuses to,*” see Fig. 1 and col. 3, ll. 13-23, “The http server 16 communicates with what is here called a ‘command utility’ 18. The command utility 18 is a set of programs or subroutines, each program corresponding to one command which influences an ‘object’ as defined above.”

Falkenhainer teaches “*present a user with options for tailoring an object,*” see Fig. 2 and “FIG. 2 is an example of a screen which can be presented to a user (typically, the owner or manager of an object) when it is desired to edit the permissions of the object.” Falkenhainer does not teach that the “*object*” is an “*object class definition*.” Owens, however, teaches that in

“object-oriented environments, a class defines a group of objects that share the same characteristics,” see col. 6, ll. 1-5. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to define a class of objects instead of a single object because doing so would have allowed Falkenhainer’s system to gain reusability of the access information, i.e. an owner could define a class of permissions that would apply to multiple files instead of a single one, see Owens col. 6, ll. 1-5.

Falkenhainer teaches “*the user input identifying: a first field*,” see Fig. 2, Table 1, col. 6, ll. 10-14, “Below is a table describing the ‘attributes’ or detailed information which may be contained within each object retained in the object database 20,” and col. 9, l. 66 – col. 10, l. 9, “FIG. 2 is an example of a screen which can be presented to a user (typically, the owner or manager of an object) when it is desired to edit the permissions of the object,” where the claimed “first field” is the referenced “readers” field in Table 1. Falkenhainer does not teach “*to be included in the tailored object class definition*.” Owens does, however, see Fig. 7, step 301. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to define a class of objects instead of a single object because doing so would have allowed Falkenhainer’s system to gain reusability of the access information, i.e. an owner could define a class of permissions that would apply to multiple files instead of a single one, see Owens col. 6, ll. 1-5.

Falkenhainer teaches “*a second field*,” see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the claimed “second field” is the referenced “writers” field of Table 1. Falkenhainer does not teach “*to be included in the tailored object class definition*.” Owens does, however, see Fig. 7, step 301. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to

define a class of objects instead of a single object because doing so would have allowed Falkenhainer's system to gain reusability of the access information, i.e. an owner could define a class of permissions that would apply to multiple files instead of a single one, see Owens col. 6, ll. 1-5.

Falkenhainer teaches "*a first user or group of users and a first identifier associated with the first field to identify that the first user or group of user is to be excluded from a first activity that involves the first field,*" see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the claimed "first user" is, for example, the referenced user "John Doe," the claimed "first identifier" is the referenced "handle," and the claimed "first activity" is the referenced reading.

Falkenhainer teaches "*and a second user or group of users and a second identifier associated with the second field to identify that the second user or group of users is to be excluded from a second activity that involves the second field,*" see Fig. 2, where the claimed "second group of users" is, for example, the referenced group "Anyone," the claimed "second identifier" is the referenced "handle," and the claimed "second activity" is the referenced writing.

Falkenhainer teaches "*tailor and store the object... to include the first field and the second field, identifiers of the first and second users or groups of users and the first and second identifiers and associations to their respective fields,*" see Table 1 and col. 8, ll. 24-33, "With the system of the present [method], however, the security properties of an object are embodied in the list of 'readers' and 'writers' listed in the object itself." Falkenhainer does not teach that the "object" is an "object class definition." Owens, however, teaches that in "object-oriented environments, a class defines a group of objects that share the same characteristics," see col. 6,

ll. 1-5. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to define a class of objects instead of a single object because doing so would have allowed Falkenhainer's system to gain reusability of the access information, i.e. an owner could define a class of permissions that would apply to multiple files instead of a single one, see Owens col. 6, ll. 1-5.

Falkenhainer does not teach "*receive user input for tailoring the object class definition in response to the presentation of options.*" Owens does, however, see Fig. 7, step 301. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to define a class of objects instead of a single object because doing so would have allowed Falkenhainer's system to gain reusability of the access information, i.e. an owner could define a class of permissions that would apply to multiple files instead of a single one, see Owens col. 6, ll. 1-5.

Falkenhainer does not teach "*and instantiate an object from the tailored object class definition.*" Owens does, however, see col. 6, ll. 1-5, "An object is created by being instantiated as a member of a class." Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the database art at the time of the invention to define a class of objects instead of a single object because doing so would have allowed Falkenhainer's system to gain reusability of the access information, i.e. an owner could define a class of permissions that would apply to multiple files instead of a single one, see Owens col. 6, ll. 1-5. Falkenhainer teaches "*the instantiated object including the association of the first identifier with the first field and the association of the second identifier with the second field, wherein during data processing activities, the instantiated object excludes the first user or group of users from the first activity and the second user or*

*group of users from the second activity,” see Table 1 and col. 8, ll. 34-44, “According to a currently-preferred embodiment... an object which describes a file, collection, or other object such as a calendar, has within its object data the ‘handles’ of its owner, its readers, and its writers... The readers are those users who have only read access to the file or collection; the writers are those users having write access.”*

3. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying a role that the first user or group of users plays in an operation,*” see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the claimed “role” is the referenced “Reader.”

4. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 3, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to associate an identifier of the role with the first field,*” see Table 1, where the claimed “identifier” is the referenced “readers” handle.

5. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying a fieldgroup that includes the first field,*” see Table 1, where the claimed “fieldgroup” is the referenced “handle-list.”

6. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to: receive first user input identifying the first field and the second field from a first individual,*” see Fig. 2, where the claimed “first individual” is the referenced user “Brian Falkenhainer.”

Falkenhainer teaches “*and receive second user input identifying the first user or group of users and the second user or group of users from a second individual*,” see Fig. 2, where the claimed “second individual” would be the referenced user “John Doe,” who, like Brian Falkenhainer, also has manager rights.

7. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions also cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying the first activity from which the first user or group of users is excluded*,” see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the users associated with the reading activity are excluded from writing.

8. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 7, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying an authorization level identifying the first activity*,” see Fig. 2, where the claimed “authorization level” is the referenced reading.

9. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 8, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input selecting the authorization level from a group of at least four authorization levels*,” see Fig. 2, where the claimed “four authorization levels” are the referenced reading, writing, managing, and none, which is indicated by “Remove From Access List.”

10. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions also cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to: identify a trigger; and based upon the identification of the trigger, end the association of the first identifier with the first field to indicate that the first user or group of users is no longer excluded from the first activity*,” see Fig. 2, where the claimed “trigger” is the user changing which boxes are checked.

11. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions also cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to: receive user input identifying an operation performed with the tailored object,*” see Fig. 2, where the claimed “operation” is the referenced reading.

Falkenhainer teaches “*and associate an operation identifier, the first identifier, and the first field to indicate that the first user or group of users is to be excluded from the first activity that involves the first field in the operation,*” see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the users associated with the reading activity are excluded from writing.

12. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 11, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to receive user input identifying a collaboration of at least two parties,*” see Fig. 2 and Table 1, where the claimed “collaboration” is the referenced user group(s).

14. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein: the first activity comprises display of contents of the first field; and the second activity comprises display of contents of the second field,*” see col. 7, ll. 42-58, “When a command regarding the properties is submitted by a user to command utility 18, the command utility 18 displays the data within the object in a usable form on the screen of the user.”

15. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 1, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to create a graphical user interface to lead a user through the tailoring,*” see Fig. 2.

16. Falkenhainer teaches “*The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the instructions cause the one or more data processing apparatuses to create the graphical user*

*interface on a web browser,”* see Fig. 2 and col. 11, ll. 40-51, “Use of any programming language through the CGI, or any web server specific interface, enable the commands to be embedded in a web server such as http server 16.”

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant’s arguments with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Sanders whose telephone number is 571-270-1016. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00a-4:00p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tim T. Vo/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
2168

/Aaron Sanders/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2168  
28 October 2009